



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,128	08/29/2001	Yoshikazu Takashima	275770US8	9308
22850 7590 07/20/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER JONES, HEATHER RAE	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/943,128	Applicant(s) TAKASHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Heather R. Jones	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues on page 7, lines 15 –25 that Mercier fails to disclose outputting a coded bit stream by a “slow operation by removing all the bidirectionally predictive-coded pictures” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner agrees that Mercier discloses in Fig. 13 creating a slow motion or pause effect by playing back I frames and inserting empty B frames to adjust the playback speed (col. 10, lines 44-54), which is opposite of the Applicant's invention. However, in col. 10, lines 20-28 Mercier discloses that empty P or empty B frames may be inserted to accommodate for the trick play modes. Therefore, Mercier just happen to do his example using the B frames, but empty P frames could have been inserted instead which would mean that a slow motion or pause effect is played back using I frames and inserting empty P frames to adjust the playback speed. Therefore, Mercier meets the limitations of claim 1 as well as claims 7 and 8 and the rejection is maintained.

The Applicant argues on page 8, lines 1-12 that regarding claim 2 the Examiner used an inherency statement and that the Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination of the allegedly inherent characteristic that necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. The Examiner respectfully disagrees that they did not

have support for the inherency statement in the Office Action. In the Office Action dated January 12, 2007 the Examiner cited Eerenberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,621,979) in pertinent art section that states in col. 24, lines 63-64 that an empty P-frame must always contain the first and last macroblock of a slice, which is required by MPEG, and that the macroblocks that are in between the first and last macroblock are skipped. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,699,474) in view of Mercier (U.S. Patent 6,865,747).

Regarding claim 1, Suzuki et al. discloses a transmitting apparatus for converting a coded bit stream into a trick play output and sending the coded bit stream to a transmission path, comprising: accumulating means for accumulating the coded bit stream including an intra-frame coded picture, a forward predictive-coded picture, and a bidirectionally predictive-coded picture (401); output control means for controlling an output of the coded bit stream in an output mode corresponding to a designated trick play operation (406); rewriting means for rewriting control data which specifies a displaying order of the pictures with

respect to the coded bit stream (86) (col. 14, lines 15-20); picture forming means for forming a picture obtained by copying a predetermined picture (col. 12, lines 49-65); output means for outputting a picture whose control data has been rewritten and the formed picture in accordance with the control of the output means (col. 12, lines 49-65). However, Suzuki fails to disclose that the coded bit stream is output by a slow operation by removing the bidirectionally predictive-coded picture and repeating output processes such that after the intra-frame coded picture and the forward predictive-coded picture which repetitively appear at intervals (m), the copied pictures of the number of larger than the (m) are outputted.

Referring to the Mercier reference, Mercier discloses an apparatus for converting a coded bit stream into a trick play output and sending the coded bit stream to a transmission path wherein the coded bit stream is output by a slow operation by removing the bidirectionally predictive-coded picture and repeating output processes such that after the intra-frame coded picture and the forward predictive-coded picture which repetitively appear at intervals (m), the copied pictures of the number of larger than the (m) are outputted (col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used repeated copied pictures that repetitively appear at intervals (m) so that the coded bit stream is outputted by a slow operation as disclosed by Mercier with the apparatus disclosed by

Suzuki et al. in order to provide the possibility to generate a valid MPEG video stream with a valid number of frames per second during trick play.

Regarding claim 2, Suzuki et al. in view of Mercier discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1, including that the predetermined picture is the intra-frame coded picture or the forward predictive-coded picture, the copied picture is outputted as a skip P picture having a structure such that macroblocks other than macroblocks at both ends of a slice is skipped (Mercier: col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 54 – this is an inherent feature required by MPEG).

Regarding claim 3, Suzuki et al. in view of Mercier discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing as for the picture which is outputted, the rewriting means makes data indicative of an accumulation amount of a virtual input buffer of a decoder in a picture header invalid (Suzuki et al: col. 14, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 7, Suzuki et al. discloses a transmission system of image information, comprising: accumulating means for accumulating a coded bit stream including an intra-frame coded picture, a forward predictive-coded picture, and a bidirectionally predictive-coded picture (401); output control means for controlling an output of the coded bit stream in an output mode corresponding to a designated trick play operation (406); rewriting means for rewriting control data which specifies a displaying order of the pictures with respect to the coded bit stream (86) (col. 14, lines 15-20); picture forming means for forming a picture

obtained by copying a predetermined picture (col. 12, lines 49-65); output means for outputting a picture whose control data has been rewritten and the formed picture as trick play output data in accordance with the control of the output means (col. 12, lines 49-65); a digital interface connected to the output means (col. 10, lines 29-34); and an apparatus for recording or displaying the trick play output data received through the digital interface (604) (col. 10, lines 35-42). However, Suzuki fails to disclose that the coded bit stream is output by a slow operation by removing the bidirectionally predictive-coded picture and repeating output processes such that after the intra-frame coded picture and the forward predictive-coded picture which repetitively appear at intervals (m), the copied pictures of the number of larger than the (m) are outputted.

Referring to the Mercier reference, Mercier discloses an apparatus for converting a coded bit stream into a trick play output and sending the coded bit stream to a transmission path wherein the coded bit stream is output by a slow operation by removing the bidirectionally predictive-coded picture and repeating output processes such that after the intra-frame coded picture and the forward predictive-coded picture which repetitively appear at intervals (m), the copied pictures of the number of larger than the (m) are outputted (col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used repeated copied pictures that repetitively appear at intervals (m) so that the coded bit stream is outputted by a

slow operation as disclosed by Mercier with the apparatus disclosed by Suzuki et al. in order to provide the possibility to generate a valid MPEG video stream with a valid number of frames per second during trick play.

Regarding claim 8, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Suzuki et al. in view of Mercier discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the picture formed by the image forming means represents an entire frame of the coded bit stream (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 11, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 9. Therefore, claim 11 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 9.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Eerenberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,621,979) discloses that an empty P-frame must always contain the first and last macroblocks of a slice, this is required by MPEG (col. 24, lines 63-64).

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather R. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2621

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
June 26, 2007



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600